

STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**THE USE OF OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE ARMY OFFICER
PROMOTION SELECTION BOARD PROCESS**

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL KATHERINE M. BIGLER
United States Army Reserve

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGE FELLOW
AY00



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

20000801 059

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**THE USE OF OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE ARMY OFFICER PROMOTION
SELECTION BOARD PROCESS**

by

LIEUTENANT COLONEL KATHERINE M. BIGLER
United States Army Reserve (AGR)

Colonel Timothy D. Harrod
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Katherine M. Bigler, LTC, USAR (AGR)
TITLE: The Use of Official Photographs in the Army Officer Promotion Selection Board Process
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 1 May 2000 PAGES: 41 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The U.S. Army is characterized as a meritocracy, with the best-qualified officers selected for promotion. Almost all promotion decisions are made by a centralized board. Since the 1970s, the Army has included an official photograph in the promotion board file. The articulated reason is to allow the board to judge military bearing and physical fitness. While this is important, there is strong evidence to suggest that the photograph is unnecessarily adding a controversial aspect to the promotion process. This paper examines the Army's current promotion system and explores where the photograph fits in. Following a discussion of how impression formation and impression management impact on the promotion board process, the results of a survey administered to U.S. Army War College students and faculty/staff members are discussed. Positive elements in the Army system are examined as well. The author's conclusion is that it is appropriate for senior leadership to examine the promotion process and discontinue use of the photograph. Alternatives to totally discontinuing use of the photographs are provided, as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	III
THE USE OF OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE ARMY OFFICER PROMOTION SELECTION BOARD PROCESS	1
THE PROMOTION SYSTEM.....	2
THE USE OF PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE PROMOTION PROCESS.....	3
THE SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE	6
FACIAL FEATURES.....	7
GENDER	9
RACE	10
IMAGE MANAGEMENT	11
SURVEY OF OFFICERS CONSIDERED BY BOARDS AND BOARD MEMBERS	12
DISCUSSION.....	14
RECOMMENDATIONS	17
CONCLUSION	19
ENDNOTES.....	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	31

THE USE OF OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE ARMY OFFICER PROMOTION SELECTION BOARD PROCESS

"... This regulation supports the objectives of the Army's officer promotion system, which include filling authorized spaces with the best-qualified officers. It also provides for career progression based upon recognition of an officer's potential to serve in positions of increased responsibility. Additionally, it precludes promoting the officer who is not eligible or becomes disqualified, thus providing an equitable system for all officers."

—Army Regulation 600-8-29

Promotion -- the word carries with it a connotation of prestige; of recognition for a job well done; of a chance for an interesting, challenging job change; a chance to remain in a profession. A promotion can have far-reaching effects on the mission of the Army and the professional development, morale, and well-being of the officer corps. And it is not just an officer's own career that is impacted by a promotion. The promotion process determines who will lead the force of the future and that, too, affects other officers. Few other actions in the Army have such a wide impact and interest for so many members.

Few would take issue with the premise that an action as important as determining who should be promoted must be based on a rational model of decision making. Today's Army is characterized as a meritocracy, where career advancement is supposed to be determined mostly by one's ability to achieve Army goals.¹ At present, the Army uses a centralized officer promotion selection system, governed by requirements set forth in statutes, Department of Defense (DoD) publications, Army Regulations (AR), and policy established by the Secretary of the Army and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. Statutory requirements include the composition of the board, the required oath for members, notice requirements, and time-in-grade for officers under consideration.² Information that can be furnished a promotion board is governed by both statute and regulation.³

The use of official photographs in the Army promotion process was added by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to statutory and DoD authority.⁴ In doing so, the Army has added a potentially controversial aspect to the Army's promotion process, which has not been addressed adequately in the past. The Army's articulated goal is to fill authorized spaces with the best-qualified officers.⁵ This paper examines the use of photographs and determines that they add a divisive, unfair and potentially discriminatory aspect to the promotion process. Army leadership should consider elimination of photographs for promotion boards.

The examination begins with an overview of the Army's current promotion system, where the photograph fits in, and why it was added to the selection process. A review of the scientific literature on the accuracy of judgements from photographs highlights the potential of such a practice for stereotyping based on race, gender, and facial features. Consideration is also given to the assumption that a photograph truly conveys how an officer looks on a day-to-day basis.

To assess the experiences and concerns of personnel involved in such processes, a survey was administered to U.S. Army War College Academic Year 2000 students and faculty/staff (the USAWC

Survey). Respondents provided their opinions on the fairness and accuracy of using photographs in the promotion selection process, answering as both considered officers and board members, if appropriate. Their responses show concern with the use of the photograph, albeit for varying reasons. Research conducted earlier at the U.S. Military Academy on the use of photographs in the promotion process is examined, along with the positive elements in the Army promotion system. Despite some limited evidence that viewing the photograph may not always be harmful, it is the combination of the many other factors discussed that leads to this conclusion: a requirement added without discriminatory animus may now be having unforeseen and unacceptable consequences that need to be evaluated by senior leadership.

THE PROMOTION SYSTEM

A promotion board is typically presided over by a general officer and usually consists of eighteen to twenty-one officers in a grade senior to that of those being considered. Each board consists of different members, and women and minority members are routinely appointed to serve on the board. Board members receive a personally-signed memorandum from the Secretary of the Army, referred to as the Memorandum of Instruction (MOI), along with a copy of DA Memo 600-2, Policies and Procedures for Active Component Officer Selection Boards.⁶ This MOI gives the officer a charter: to recognize those officers who will make the greatest contributions as Army leaders in the years ahead; to ensure that all eligible officers are considered without prejudice or partiality; and to adhere to all governing laws, directives, regulations, and written instructions. The MOI also sets forth the method for selection and the number to be selected.

DA Memo 600-2 provides board members with criteria for selection. It provides that decisions of the board will be weighed in terms of each officer's demonstrated character and performance and the potential of that officer for further outstanding service. It further stipulates board members should use a specified framework to evaluate potential, "in the order of the member's personal priorities." The framework consists of (a) military bearing and physical fitness; (b) military education and training; (c) civilian education and training; (d) assignment history and professional development; (e) performance; and (f) professional attributes and ethics.⁷

Board members are restricted in what they can review during the board proceedings. AR 600-8-29 and DA Memo 600-2 provide that they can review the following documents: the performance portion of the Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) (including documents authorized for filing on the OMPF but not yet filed); the Officer Record Brief (ORB); an official photograph, if available; certain authorized communication to the board; and approved separation documents.

At least 30 days before convening a promotion selection board, U.S. Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM) will announce in writing the date that the board will convene and the zone for consideration. Officers to be considered are notified either personally or by general announcement. The notification includes advice on submitting an individual memorandum to the board and stresses timely review and

update of the OMPF and ORB if required. Individuals are also encouraged to update the official photograph if not current.

THE USE OF PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE PROMOTION PROCESS

The basic concept of the promotion selection system is to select for promotion those officers who have demonstrated that they possess the professional and moral qualifications, integrity, physical fitness, and ability required to successfully perform the duties expected of an officer at the next higher grade. Promotion is not intended to be a reward for long, honorable service in the present grade, but is based on overall demonstrated performance and potential abilities.⁸

The framework for this evaluation is much like that in the civilian sector: education; assignment history and professional development; performance and potential as documented by raters familiar with the applicant's ability and experience; professional attributes; and ethics. There is, however, one aspect considered in the military system that is usually not evaluated in the civilian sector: military bearing and physical fitness. It is this piece of the framework that has the potential to create problems.

Seemingly neutral practices, such as using the official photograph to determine military bearing and physical fitness, can mask the other potential issues. This is not to suggest that boards do not pay attention to qualifications and ability. But personnel decisions are made by human beings, and there is considerable evidence that human decision making is often fraught with biases and errors.

An analysis of the appropriateness of using photographs begins with a thorough examination of how it is that they came to be used by promotion boards. The history of the present use of photographs by promotion boards can be explored by a review of several different Army regulations. Passage of the Officer Personnel Act in 1947 (the 1947 Act) marked an attempt by Congress to provide for centralized officer management and to ensure that the military followed a meritocratic system of promotion. The 1947 Act outlawed the practice of blanket promotion based on seniority and replaced it with promotion based on merit.⁹ Centralized promotion boards were noted as being held as early as 1959¹⁰ and a 1960 regulation mentions promotion boards considering both individual letters and efficiency reports.¹¹ There was not, however, any specific mention of consideration of photographs for many years to follow. The regulation governing promotion limited consideration to individual letters and efficiency reports until a 1975 version of the regulation was published.¹² This version of the regulation only mentioned consideration of personal correspondence to the board and efficiency reports, but for the first time the regulation contained authority for a Letter of Instruction (LOI) from the Secretary of the Army to board members, authorizing them to review other factors as well.¹³

It is clear that by 1979, promotion boards were considering photographs. The 1979 promotion regulation specifically mentioned that the information provided to a selection board for each individual considered would include the performance fiche, the ORB, and personal correspondence to the board.¹⁴ A 1970 revision of the personnel records regulation had noted, for the first time, that the latest photograph taken was to be filed on the performance fiche.¹⁵ The connection between filing photographs on the

performance fiche in AR 640-10 and providing the performance fiche to promotion board members in AR 624-100 definitively linked the photograph to the promotion file.¹⁶

The requirement for the photograph on the performance fiche for enlisted grades E6-E9 and all warrant and commissioned officers except second lieutenants continued until 1984. From that point to the present, only photographs of general officers have been authorized for filing on the fiche.¹⁷ Between 1984 and 1989, the photographs were viewed by board members under authority in an LOI.¹⁸ A 1989 revision of the promotion regulation added specific mention of boards considering an official photograph, if available.¹⁹ This provision was carried forward into a new promotion regulation, which superseded AR 624-100 in 1994 and remains in effect today.²⁰

The above data indicates when photographs were first used, but it does not reveal why they were first used. It may have been the change from field promotions in a unit to centralized promotions that caused senior leaders to feel they needed to see a photograph. Or, it just may have been circumstances, a carry-over from filing photographs on the performance fiche. While it is possible that photographs were added to permit boards to consider race, ethnicity, and gender more easily, it wasn't until 1977 that boards were required to be aware of and take into consideration that rating differences existed.²¹ The promotion regulation does not specify why official photographs are provided to the board. Guidance to the board on the use of the photograph does not appear to have been provided to the boards until the 1990s. DA Memo 600-2, first published in 1993, mentioned consideration of the photograph only while discussing military bearing and physical fitness.²² This language on use of the photographs was carried forward to the LOI as well.²³

It is interesting to note that this 1993 publication of the DA Memo mentioning proper consideration of the photograph was also the first time the Army implemented the review and re-vote procedures with its equal opportunity (EO) goals.²⁴ Boards sitting from fiscal year 1992 through fiscal year 1999 used these review and re-vote procedures.²⁵ Prior to that time, the Army's promotion selection boards had demonstrated a record of not consistently meeting equal opportunity goals. Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, only one board met all of its EO goals and a number of individual boards during the 1980s exhibited alarming under-selection rates for minorities and women. The Army examined the reasons for persistent discrepancy in the promotion rates, but was unable to definitively pinpoint any single systemic reason for the disparity. It was because of that uncertainty that the Army instituted the EO review and re-vote procedure in DA Memo 600-2.²⁶ The added emphasis on the proper use of the photograph could have been connected to the new EO procedures, but whether or not it was remains pure conjecture. Whether boards subject to the review and re-vote procedures of the 1990s were helped or hindered by seeing photographs is a topic considered later.

Photographs were originally taken in black and white film, full length, printed in 4" x 10" format. In 1991, the regulation was revised to provide that all DA photographs were to be in color.²⁷ However, due to the lack of color photograph equipment at some installations, black and white photographs remained acceptable. In February, 1995, a working group was formed to study different formats, techniques,

procedures and equipment in order to find an official DA photograph format that made optimum use of recently developed digital technology. Articulated reasons for the transition to digital imaging included cost savings, cost avoidance, timesavings, image quality, and efficient use of current technology.²⁸ Tests were run at Fort Carson, Colorado, on the use of digital photography for the official photographs.²⁹ A new format, approved by the Chief of Staff of the Army on 30 August 1995,³⁰ was a 3/4 length electronic imaging photograph with color background. Until transition to 100 percent electronic imaging was achieved, there were three acceptable processes for official photographs: black and white, color, and color digital.³¹

As early as 1994, DoD recognized that the emergence of digital technology could significantly increase the capability of altering photographic imagery.³² DoD addressed the issue in a directive in 1995,³³ which was forwarded to the field with Secretary of the Army procedural guidance on digital photography on 18 September 1995.³⁴ Noting the DoD zero tolerance policy on altering photographs, the guidance stressed that photographers could improve only the contrast, color balance and light levels electronically. They were expressly prohibited from altering the image in any way as to misrepresent the actual image. Photograph facilities were also expressly prohibited from issuing the computer file to the soldier. It is possible that a soldier could have the same computer program used by photograph facilities on a personal computer. Therefore, the Army photographer places the Department of Defense Visual Information Activity Number of the photograph activity in the upper right corner of the digital photograph. This adds an official mark to negate the possibility of a soldier-produced photograph.³⁵

The importance of this photograph in the promotion process is stressed at all levels. After-action reports from recent boards include these comments:³⁶

Photos still matter. Photos give the board that all-important "first impression." Photos in which an officer shows poor appearance or has medals or insignia incorrectly displayed still exist and send a message to the board. Likewise, the absence of a photo sends a message. The photo should remain in the file and we should continue to standardize background, lighting, color quality, etc, used by DA studios.³⁷

Photographs. Photographs are still very important in the selection process. Several photos were out of date or missing. Appearance of overweight is still perceived as putting officers at risk. We were surprised by the number of uniform violations in DA photos. New photographs are much better.³⁸

Official photographs remain one of the three items seen by boards. Photos at previous rank which were more than five years old (CPT photo for promotion to LTC), missing photos, ill-fitting uniforms, or improperly worn rank or insignia were noted. It remains an individual officer's responsibility to ensure his/her file is current.³⁹

Officers are not unaware of the importance placed on the photographs. The PERSCOM web site, designed to provide information to officers under consideration by a board, indicates that board members say that the photograph is what gives them the first impression of a file and that an officer never gets a second chance to make a good first impression. They note that these features carry the most amount of weight with the board: a neat appearance, a relaxed look, a facial expression which reflects that the

officer enjoys what he is doing, and a look of confidence in appearance.⁴⁰ The Army Reserve, too, stresses the importance of the photograph in both official publications and on their web site.⁴¹

This emphasis on the importance of the photograph to board members requires that senior leadership pay close attention to issues of impression formation and management. Board members correctly note that they are seeing the photographs for military bearing and physical fitness. However, at the same time, inappropriate impression formation could be occurring. Impression formation occurs when a perceiver decodes messages and forms impressions of people; it happens repeatedly and often without awareness. Impression management, the flip side of impression formation, is discussed in detail later. If consideration of a photograph could trigger inappropriate impression formation, whether consciously or subconsciously, reconsideration of using the photograph is in order.⁴²

When a board member first views the official photograph of an officer, there are a number of sources of information presented. There are dynamic aspects, those that can be changed by the officer: haircut and hairstyle, how the uniform looks, the choice of jewelry, whether the officer smiles, frowns, or looks serious. Few would argue with the validity of a board member considering some of the aspects presented in a photograph: a military haircut or hairstyle, a well-fitting and well-kept uniform worn with the proper accoutrements. But what about other dynamic aspects that are authorized but may not show a "corporate fit," such as a mustache, a certain hairstyle? Or earrings for women, slacks instead of a skirt? Can or should a board consider these? Then there are characteristics, such as gender, skin color, height, attractiveness and face shape, that are outside the officer's ability to change. At the heart of the concern is whether inclusion of the photograph with all its potential "baggage" is beneficial, or whether it works against promotion objectives in a meritocracy. For that determination, a review of the literature on impression formation and the existence of stereotypes is necessary.

THE SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE

The social psychological literature is full of evidence that perceptions of others are heavily influenced by stereotypes. DA Memo 600-2 tells board members to consider demonstrated character, performance, and potential for further outstanding service when making their promotion decisions. But are characteristics subject to stereotyping inappropriately influencing the board as they evaluate the officer under consideration?⁴³ There is nothing to suggest that the use of photographs was added to the promotion file with any discriminatory intent. However, policies, both old and new, must be constantly evaluated to ensure that they are not contributing to institutional discrimination. A policy established for neutral reasons can still have discriminatory impact. While the Army has consistently been concerned with addressing past institutional discrimination against minorities and females, it would be naive to believe that all forms of illegal discrimination have been resolved and no further monitoring or changes are required.

Stereotyping is a cognitive process, which acts to guide the attention, storage, and recall of information about others.⁴⁴ The process of categorization in stereotyping is influenced by frameworks which are based on past experiences or, quite often, cultural learning. Characteristics of others that are

particularly salient (e.g. gender, race) are especially strong bases or cues for categorization.⁴⁵ If a perceiver holds a particular belief about members of a stereotyped group, the research below suggests that those beliefs may bias later information processing.

The literature pertaining to person perception analyzes the effects of characteristics on personality attributions and then the causal attribution made during later evaluation of the person under consideration. The implicit theory of personality suggests that we all have various internal beliefs or conceptions about personality traits. People are inclined to view certain personality characteristics as occurring with other characteristics. A first impression situation may result in a perceiver jumping to conclusions about a number of characteristics of the observed individual based on the observation of very few traits. This rapid process is valuable in a number of day-to-day situations, but inappropriate when making critical decisions impacting a person's life. Many assumptions about others are merely cultural theories that can readily be refuted by observation. However, people continue to accept these assumptions even though they fly in the face of reason.⁴⁶

Review of the literature indicates that three characteristics visible in an official photograph could inappropriately influence board members: facial features, gender, and race.

FACIAL FEATURES

The physical appearance of a person can have a broad influence on judgements made about him or her. Much of what is judged attractive is beyond the ability to change. Throughout history, people have believed that physical looks reflect character. Physiognomy, the features of the face, and physique, a person's body shape, have been seen as revealing of the personality. Fat people have been perceived as jolly, people with high foreheads as intelligent.

There are two aspects to consider when studying facial features. Everyone has unique bone structure, due to genetic makeup. Associations made between this bone structure and personality would suggest that a personality trait is something one is born with. For example, looking at facial structure, a certain nose may be seen as indicating nobility of character, or certain eye structure suggesting shadiness of character. Everyone also has a muscular aspect. Consideration of this aspect assumes a person's experience influences his facial appearance and that characteristics of personality can be read from the face. A sour man will have a sour-looking face, for example.

In Victorian times there were attempts to identify the criminal and other personalities from facial characteristics. Now one would question the assumptions linking facial features and crime, and the resulting discrimination against the unfortunates who had 'criminal' features. While society has come far from those days, the scientific literature shows that perceptions of others continue to be influenced by stereotypes based on physical characteristics.

An early test to determine whether inferred traits from physical features were valid was conducted in 1928.⁴⁷ A group of female students who knew each other well looked at photographs of each other and rated them on a number of personality characteristics. Then other students who did not know them rated the same photographs on the same personality characteristics. The students who did not know the

subjects of the photographs made consistently similar judgements about the personality traits of the subjects, as did the students who knew the subjects. The judgements of the two groups, however, differed markedly. The only two characteristics that showed some agreement were intelligence and beauty.

A study to determine if judgements of intelligence were valid was conducted using photographs of the faces of forty-six soldiers.⁴⁸ These soldiers were given IQ tests and then twenty-five subjects who didn't know the soldiers rated each face on a number of traits, including intelligence. There was a high degree of consensus on which faces looked intelligent. The ratings, however, did not correlate with the soldiers' IQ results.

People with more attractive physical appearances are perceived as having more socially desirable traits and behavioral tendencies, including expected occupational success. In an experiment involving both students and experienced recruiters conducting job interviews, attractive applicants were perceived as having a more appropriate personality for a managerial job, were expected to perform better than their less attractive counterparts, and were more likely to be selected for hire.⁴⁹ Research has also shown that attractiveness biases are prevalent in admission rating and personality attributions,⁵⁰ teacher evaluations of students,⁵¹ voter preferences for political candidates,⁵² and jury judgements in mock trials.⁵³

Some physical appearance cues can be rather easily modified. A person wearing glasses may be seen as more intelligent, dependable and industrious than when not wearing them. Glasses imply reading and reading implies knowledge. By inference, they must be intelligent.⁵⁴ One study considered hair color and cosmetics use by rated female job applicants. The applicant was rated as more capable and assigned a higher beginning salary when she was not wearing cosmetics. Similarly, the applicant was rated more capable and assigned a higher salary when depicted with brunette hair rather than either red or blonde hair.⁵⁵ The benefit of not wearing cosmetics may, however, be tied to the position of the woman. Another study addressed the question of whether the use of cosmetics significantly affects a woman's probability of gaining professional or non-professional employment.⁵⁶ This study found that cosmetics use had a negative effect on the expected performance of female applicants for a gender-typed position (secretary), but no effect on the expected performance of female applicants for a non-gender-typed position (accountant).

An interesting study specific to the military looked at physical features of the U.S. Military Academy Class of 1950. Researchers first analyzed the class in the early 1980s.⁵⁷ Then, when all of the Class of 1950 had retired (by 1987), findings from the original study were reexamined and again reported.⁵⁸ The authors of the study noted that they were not denying the relevance of personal ability and effort in promotions. They did, however, suggest that consideration of "visibility" and channels provide a more complete explanation of the Army promotion process and its outcomes. Channeling is not connected to appearance. However, visibility -- literally how one looks -- is. Using the yearbook graduation portraits, facial dominance was measured for all cadets who remained on active duty for twenty years or more.

The result: facial characteristics are significant.⁵⁹ Dominant looking men were found to have an advantage in promotion to the highest ranks of general officer.⁶⁰

Facial features are not always viewed alone. A study was conducted on facial features and body type together, to see if one influenced the other or if one was more relevant than the other for impression formation. In the study, male photograph subjects with a wide face and thin body received the highest personality rating; a thin male face, whether the body is thin or wide, received the lowest rating. The female photograph subjects' ratings were opposite of the males. Thin-faced females were preferred overall, regardless of their body size. If a woman had a wide face, it was better if she also had a thin body.⁶¹

GENDER

As the study on cosmetics and hair color illustrates, issues of attractiveness and gender are often intertwined. Attractiveness can have an impact on career success for women. Two lawsuits have highlighted the potential consequence of making decisions that impact a woman's career because of her looks. One case involved a student's physical appearance (weight) on college admission and academic status decisions.⁶² The other is the more well-known case involving Christine Craft, the former TV news anchor who sued the Kansas City station who demoted her for being "too ugly."⁶³

In 1993, the first major study of the connection between a person's looks and earnings was reported. Economists found, all other factors being equal, the "good-looking" earn 10 percent more than the "homely" and that the situation is worse for men than women.⁶⁴ A 1996 study by economists found that good-looking lawyers made more money, as much as 14 percent more than their less-handsome peers. The study also noted that being attractive helped in winning early partnership.⁶⁵ But reaction to what is good-looking is sex-typed. Attractive women are preferred over unattractive women for traditionally female, clerical positions. But the less attractive females are preferred for traditionally male positions, such as managerial posts.⁶⁶

The Army's perception of appropriate female attire in official photographs is of interest. In 1982, an interim change to the 1976 photograph regulation provided that women could wear the Class A Uniform with either skirt or pants in the official photograph, but they had to wear pumps if they were wearing skirts.⁶⁷ In the 1985 reissue of that regulation, women were required to have their photograph taken in a skirt "for the purpose of uniformity."⁶⁸ In 1986, women were again authorized to have their photographs taken in Class A pantsuits, but they still had to wear pumps if they wore a skirt.⁶⁹ This was despite the fact that "low quarter" shoes are authorized by regulation for wear with the Class A Uniform with skirt.⁷⁰ The current version of the photograph regulation allows pants but retains this restriction on footwear if a skirt is worn.⁷¹ The change to digital 3/4 length photographs makes footwear a moot issue. However, whether or not a woman chooses to wear a skirt and thus perhaps be perceived as more feminine is not eliminated. Per Army guidance, digitally produced photographs run from approximately two inches above

the top of the head to about two inches below the jacket bottom and photographers must ensure that both hands are visible. A review of several recent digital photographs of women evidenced that whether they wore a skirt or pants was still apparent in the digital photographs.⁷²

Height, another factor not subject to change, can also impact impression. For men, shortness is perceived as a disadvantage in a number of respects. We have the expression 'walk tall,' implying that the man of strong character stands tall to face the world. This point is not lost on politicians. The 1989 U.S. Presidential candidate, Michael Dukakis, stood on a raised platform in a televised debate with the taller George Bush. Only twice in this century have the shorter of two candidates defeated their taller opponents (Richard Nixon defeating George McGovern in 1968 and Jimmy Carter defeating Gerald Ford in 1976).⁷³

RACE

With the prevalence of racial issues in the news, there is probably more awareness that inappropriate judgements based on the color of skin can be made, either consciously or subconsciously. Stereotypes and the resulting damage can be seen on almost any newscast, e.g., the recent forty-one bullets used in the shooting of the unarmed Amadou Diallo in New York City. Public service advertisements also remind viewers that they may rush to make judgements. A recent *Boston Globe* advertisement showed facial pictures of two men and queried, "(W)hich man looks guilty?" At a current awareness level, informed Americans probably recognize the issue and know not to say the Black man. But abundant evidence suggests that negative stereotypes persist.⁷⁴ The photographs in the *Boston Globe* advertisement were actually of the same man, with skin color variation. Similarly, another recent advertisement in *Time* magazine showed a picture of a Black male and went on to describe a serious crime. The advertisement asked if you think the person accused was guilty. It then disclosed that yes, the person was guilty and was found guilty, but the pictured man was not the perpetrator, but rather the successful prosecutor at the trial.

A recent study of more than 123,000 Caucasian and minority Army officers considered for promotion to captain, major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel found that minorities are underrepresented in the Army's middle officer ranks and minority officers are promoted at lower rates than majority officers. Except for Native American officers, cumulative promotion rates for minorities also indicated adverse effects beginning at the rank of major and lieutenant colonel.⁷⁵ While there may be many factors that can account for this discrepancy, the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences noted in 1988 that:

The most subtle and the most pervasive source of institutional discrimination has to be personal biases that, either intentionally or unintentionally, can affect the decisions made by Army supervisors, leaders, and managers in the day-to-day execution of their job-related responsibilities. Every day and in numerous ways, every Army member in a position of authority makes decisions that affect the lives and careers of other members of the Army. . . . All of these decisions are governed by policies and by procedural guidelines, yet each has some element of personal discretion that permits decision-makers to interpret and implement as they see fit. The vast majority of these decision-

makers would vehemently deny that racial or gender-related prejudices enter into their decisions; yet, the outcomes of those decisions over long periods of time . . . demonstrate that there are still systematic differences by race.⁷⁶

Stereotype activation based on race can be spontaneous, and it may automatically occur. This is not to suggest that exposure to stereotyped individuals always results in spontaneous stereotype activation. The automatic activation of stereotypes is neither inevitable nor universal. Knowledge of a cultural stereotype is common to all, but non-prejudiced individuals do not automatically activate applicable racial stereotypes when exposed to stereotyped group members.⁷⁷

The literature, which was discussed above, points to the potential for stereotyping when using photographs in the promotion process. From there, a consideration of how accurately the official photograph used by a promotion board depicts the subject of the photograph is warranted.

IMAGE MANAGEMENT

Awareness of the potential for photographs to be viewed a particular way is apparent when speaking to photographed military personnel and Army photographers. Anecdotal accounts and interviews with photographers suggest that military personnel are indeed aware of the potential for impression formation when their photographs are used. To counter it, they use impression management. Impression management occurs when the subject of the photograph does everything he can to control the way board members see him and the image that they develop of him. Most officers do this routinely and probably without knowledge that what they are involved in is known as impression management. Impression management is at work when officers either purchase a new uniform or save a uniform just for official photographs. Soldiers routinely present to the photograph lab with fresh haircuts, and even powder on their facial hair.⁷⁸ Prior to digital photography, a soldier was free to obtain an official photograph from any source. Some officers paid for a photograph taken at a private lab, feeling they did a better job on the photograph.⁷⁹ Many officers probably remember the story of the officer who had his photograph taken while lying down, so as to appear thinner. Since the introduction of the digital photograph and its attendant possibility of manipulation, only Army-prepared photographs are now authorized.⁸⁰

Army photographers participate in impression management too. The typical problem they see is the uniform being too tight but they note that the use of light definition can assist with that problem. Stories abound of photographers changing the angle of the head to improve the neck size, of taping, and clipping and pinning the uniform.⁸¹ Unfortunately, all Army photographers may not be equal. After-action board reports have noted that photograph quality ran the full range from poor to very good, it appearing that some labs and photographers were not putting their best effort into official photographs, with poor lighting, poor color, and out of focus photographs.⁸² Another board noted that the photographs were of inconsistent quality and that officers who did not have quality photographs in their files appeared to be disadvantaged.⁸³

How do officers feel about the use of these photographs in the promotion process? In order to gain more insight into how both considered officers and board members feel about the use of the photograph in the promotion process, the Academic Year 2000 (AY 2000) U.S. Army War College (USAWC) students and faculty/staff were surveyed. A discussion of the survey methodology and findings follows.

SURVEY OF OFFICERS CONSIDERED BY BOARDS AND BOARD MEMBERS

The AY2000 USAWC class consists of primarily Active Component officers, along with some U.S. Army Reserve and Army National Guard officers. Of the fifty-eight officers responding to the survey, two-thirds were students and one-third were faculty/staff members. Only two were female.⁸⁴ Ten indicated they were members of a minority group.⁸⁵ Thirty-four of those responding were at the rank of lieutenant colonel (O-5) and twenty-three were at the rank of colonel (O-6).⁸⁶ The survey was posted on the USAWC Intranet and all students and faculty/staff who were U.S. Army officers were invited to take the survey. It was administered in an anonymous manner and consisted of multiple choice questions and sections to provide detailed responses, if appropriate and desired.

The students in the USAWC are by no means a representative sample of the officer corps; they represent an elite rather than a cross-section of the officer corps as a whole.⁸⁷ Many of the faculty/staff are themselves USAWC graduates. However, all responding officers have been in the military for more than sixteen years (the vast majority had over twenty years of active federal service) and by virtue of their experience, their responses bear significant weight.

The survey, titled "Assessment of the Army Officer Promotion System" began with explanatory information on the promotion selection process followed by thirty-two questions to assess the respondents' opinions as officers considered by boards. Only ten of these questions addressed the use of photographs; the remainder dealt with other documentation seen by the boards. Nine of the responding officers had also served on promotion selection boards and they were asked to answer twenty-six additional questions about their experiences serving on a board.

Eighty-six percent of the responding officers felt it was appropriate to consider military bearing and physical fitness when determining promotion potential. However, in response to the question, "(I)n your opinion, can you determine military bearing and physical fitness from a photograph?", 28 percent responded yes, 52 percent responded no, and 21 percent were not sure.⁸⁸ Forty-three of those responding went on to elaborate with comments; of those, thirty-three provided strongly-worded comments on the inappropriate use of the photograph for reasons which included dependence on the expertise of the photographer, the fact that thin does not equate to fit and larger bodies do not mean lack of fitness, and the use of tape and paper clips. In a related question, 38 percent of the respondents felt that board members were using the photograph to make judgements on qualities other than military bearing and physical fitness. Twenty-eight percent did not believe they were, while 34 percent were unsure. In detailed responses provided by twenty-two officers, nine said they felt that the photograph was appropriately being used to view the appearance of the uniform, insignia and awards. Thirteen felt that

the photograph was being used inappropriately as a tool or discriminator to make judgements based on race, gender, size, hair color, shape, mustaches, and looks in general.

On the subject of the use of digital photographs, forty officers responded on the value of the change from black and white, to color, to 3/4 digital. Five felt the photograph should not be included at all, and an equal number mentioned the increased possibility of manipulation of digital photographs. They recognized the importance of the photograph, with 89 percent opining that if the photograph were not in the file, it would adversely impact the officer's chance for promotion. Only two respondents indicated that they had not provided a photograph to a board. One noted it was when he was very "young and dumb and arrogant" and the other noted that he tried five times to get the photograph there when he was stationed in Europe but was unsuccessful.⁸⁹ The recognized importance of the photograph corresponds to the responses from board members, where 78 percent indicated that if a photograph were missing, it would have an impact on their decision-making. Most commented that if a photograph was missing, it put doubt into the process, that either the officer did not care, could not follow instructions, or had something to hide. One responding board member noted that it was not a beauty contest and height/weight data was enough; another noted that they were briefed that there were reasons other than hiding or lack of attention that could result in a photograph not being available. Two of the nine responding board members reported that there were documents provided that they did not consider necessary. One felt that the photograph could be eliminated (along with any reference to race/ethnic group on the ORB) and one felt that awards papers could be eliminated if the problem with filming of awards on the fiche was fixed.

Board members who responded to the survey were asked how much time they spent on average on each record they reviewed. One indicated less than two minutes and the other responses varied from the 3-4 minute range (four respondents), to the 5-7 minute range (two respondents) to the 8-10 minute range (one respondent) and the 10-12 minute range (one respondent). They unanimously indicated that they spent one minute or less looking at the photograph. When asked to assign a weight to the six items they were to consider in making a promotion decision, one gave 3 percent to military bearing and physical fitness; one gave 5 percent; one gave 15 percent; and one gave 20 percent.⁹⁰ None ranked military bearing and physical fitness in the first two positions of importance; one ranked it third, two ranked it fourth, and one ranked it fifth.

How accurate are these beliefs reported in the survey, that board members are making inappropriate judgements based on photographs? Is there something about the military system that ensures that this does not happen? Is there a link between the photograph and perceptions of the promotion system? Does viewing a photograph of an officer at an artificial best have any relevance in the selection process? These issues, and others, are examined in the discussion below.

DISCUSSION

There is a lack of supporting evidence for almost all judgements based on physical characteristics, but there is abundant evidence that humans continue to make them, usually without much thought. A momentary expression is seen as an enduring characteristic; a smiling face is seen as indicating a good-tempered person. Humans often generalize from someone they know to someone they don't know. They categorize -- someone is a member of a group (sex, race), so the perceiver infers that he has characteristics believed to be held by that group. They may infer a certain quality from a feature on a face: thin lips pressed together are seen as indicating someone who is "tight-lipped" in personality; glasses indicate someone who reads a lot. Board members are human and as likely as any other person to make judgements. However, several factors inherent in the promotion process may help keep judgements made from inappropriately influencing board results.

One of the most effective ways to reduce bias due to gender, facial features, or a host of other variables is to gain as much relevant information as possible. Person-perception literature suggests that as increasing amounts of specific and relevant information are gained about a person, many common generalizations or stereotypes tend to break down and the person may be more validly seen as the unique individual that he or she is.⁹¹ The combination of information seen by a board can lead to a different interpretation than an isolated element. Board members do not see only the photograph and care must be used in generalizing from studies that involved isolated factors.

Where there is a conflict or inconsistency between different pieces of information (for example, features that carry a negative stereotype and excellent efficiency reports), one source can be preferred over the other, with the other piece of inconsistent information being ignored, explained away, or discounted. Or, a compromise can take place. Two factors that affect how a perceiver resolves conflicting information are ambiguity and commitment. When two pieces of information point in different directions, the more ambiguous piece of information will likely be shaped by the less ambiguous piece.⁹² Commitment occurs when a perceiver of information forms an opinion about the person based on information that appears very authentic, as would documentation in a promotion file. The more authentic the evidence viewed, the stronger is the perceiver's commitment to the resulting impression. Recording one's opinion or expressing one's views also strengthens feelings of commitment. That, too, may be at work in the Army process. Board members are permitted to highlight certain information on the file they are reviewing, to be seen by other board members. Only factual information is allowed to be presented. Thus, a written comment such as "this officer has a certain medal" might be appropriate, while a written comment such as "this soldier is so overweight, his photo weighs four pounds" is not.⁹³

Another possible factor at work is the continuum model of impression formation theory, which suggests that humans make a rapid initial categorization of an individual on the basis of some piece of information learned about them, such as race, gender or attractiveness. If the person is of little relevance or interest (such as a stranger passing on the street might be), if a negative impression was formed, it would be left at that. However, when the person is of greater relevance to the perceiver, such as they

would be to board members, more attention is paid to all information available, first of all to check that the initial categorization was appropriate. If the information is consistent with the original classification, category confirmation takes place. However, if the information is clearly inconsistent, the perceiver seeks an alternative category for the person in a process called re-categorization.⁹⁴

In studies involving the order of presentation of information, there has been found to be generally a primacy effect, where early impressions had more influence than later ones on the final impression. The promotion board receives the file with the photograph placed in a position to be seen first. This could easily be changed. Studies also suggest that a tendency toward primacy effects can be minimized if subjects (perceivers) are forewarned that they will be asked to justify their impression of a target person.⁹⁵ This, too, might be at work in officer promotion boards. Board members score the files on the six different categories, giving scores of 1-6 in each category.⁹⁶ At the beginning of each board, members are asked if they are willing to use the "aberrant vote procedure." If they agree, and if board members are out of tolerance from their fellow board members by more than two whole scores, the board member giving the aberrant vote is asked to re-look at the file and the score. A change may or may not be made.⁹⁷ But knowing that the scores are subject to review for aberrant votes may be enough to temper the primacy effect of seeing the photograph first.

There is also an emerging field of study based on motivation, which provides that people who are motivated to draw a particular conclusion attempt to construct a coherent justification for it.⁹⁸ While opinions on the subject are conflicting, the theory suggests that motivation may provide for the activation and inhibition of stereotypes. Every person belongs to numerous social groups, for example, gender, ethnicity, occupation. Motivation may provoke stereotype activation and inhibition when the perceiver is motivated to form a particular impression of an individual.⁹⁹ The perceiver may pick and choose among the many stereotypes applicable to an individual, activating those that support a desired impression and inhibiting those that challenge it.¹⁰⁰ People who are motivated to think highly of an individual may activate those applicable positive stereotypes that can lend support to their desired impression while at the same time inhibiting those applicable negative stereotypes that can undercut their desired impression. In contrast, people who are motivated to disparage the same individual may activate the applicable negative stereotypes while inhibiting the positive ones.¹⁰¹ It could be that board members see a good evaluation from a senior rater and are motivated to see the officer under consideration as an outstanding officer, activating positive stereotypes, while inhibiting negative stereotypes. One study suggested that people may be able to inhibit normally activated stereotypes when their processing goals require such inhibition,¹⁰² but others have argued that this conclusion was not fully supported by the data on which it was based.¹⁰³

If board members are forming inappropriate impressions based on photographs, their seniority may counter the impact of that judgement. In the Gilmore study,¹⁰⁴ 75 percent of the low-experience managers selected a highly attractive candidate as their number one choice; 65 percent of the moderately

experienced managers followed suit, but only 47 percent of the high-experience managers preferred highly attractive candidates. Senior officers, by virtue of their experience and training, may be less likely to let cognitive biases lead to selective attention to non-relevant or inappropriate characteristics.

All of these possibilities may have been at work in two very limited experiments involving Army officers. In 1989, the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership at the U.S. Military Academy conducted two PERSCOM-funded experiments at the request of the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans.¹⁰⁵ During actual Army promotion board proceedings, board members are provided with a separate file for each officer under consideration. The top document in that file is the official photograph, if the officer has submitted one.¹⁰⁶ The first experiment scored seventy actual officer files with photographs, without photographs, and with the photograph not viewed until last and compared the results against the actual promotion board results of the same records. The experiment found that "the consistency and the accuracy of board members' judgements (scoring of the criteria and final rank ordering of the files relative to the record board results) are not affected by the presence or absence of photographs in the files."¹⁰⁷

The second experiment examined what effect the presence of a photograph of either a White officer or a Black officer had on the scoring and rank ordering of the officer's file. Photographs of three Black officers were switched with photographs of three White officers with the same branch of service. The change in the scoring of the files on the criteria used by promotion boards (performance, assignment history, awards, education and military bearing/physical fitness) was measured, along with any changes in the final order of merit list (OML) rankings. The experiment noted some changes in the overall scoring of the criteria, both up and down, but no significant difference in the scoring of the files or their final OML rankings.

How do other services handle the issue of using photographs? The Navy and Marine Corps use photographs while the Air Force did, but ceased using them in 1995.¹⁰⁸ The Air Force change was based on many factors. The photograph requirement was noted as having been a constant issue of debate and officers had often questioned the need to maintain a current photograph. Board members noted that photographs had minimal impact on promotion selections.¹⁰⁹

A 1994 survey of all thirty-five members of the Air Force lieutenant colonel board had identified the photograph as the least important factor considered. The majority of the members said they gave the photograph "a little" importance when scoring records. Thirty percent said they gathered a sense of the person from the photograph, while 28 percent indicated they got a military/professional image from it. Sixteen percent indicated they judged compliance with Air Force standards from it, and 13 percent said they saw race and gender. When asked verbally if removing the photograph would distract from the credibility of the board process, 26 percent said it would not distract at all and 34 percent said only a little. A specific comment noted the possibility for impact from inappropriate judgements about race and gender. In a hand count during the discussion period, most members indicated they wanted to keep the photographs in the folders. While this appears to be a contradictory stance, it may merely suggest an unwillingness to support change in a public forum.

The cost and administrative workload involved with the photograph were other factors cited by the Air Force in deciding to change. Using 1994 data, they found that \$2.8 million in manpower and \$600,000 for supplies and equipment were expended annually for this requirement. At the time the change was proposed, the photograph was the sole source for determining race, gender and ethnicity in order to comply with reporting requirements to higher headquarters. Therefore, the Air Force added an alternative source of this information -- race, gender and ethnic codes, just like those used by the Army on ORBs.

Many of the reasons for change enumerated above apply to the Army as well. As indicated by the USAWC survey, there is strong opinion that the photograph is being used for other than a determination of military bearing and physical fitness. In May 1995, Major Samuel Nichols and Vicki Ferguson collected cost data to support an Army Ideas for Excellence Program proposal submitted.¹¹⁰ The estimated cost for color photographs, considering all photographic functions, ranged from \$2.60 to \$5.45 each. Not computed into this figure was the time spent having a photograph taken and in handling the photograph at PERSCOM. The cost involved with digital photographs is likely less, but it is still a cost for something that board members spend one minute or less reviewing.

It is widely recognized that the Army has led the country in developing positive race relations.¹¹¹ However, the recent study of data through 1997 indicates that within DoD as a whole, promotion rates for Black men and women are lower up to the critical O-4 point when compared to White men.¹¹² And the use of photographs by the Army could be contributing to these results. An analysis of promotion results is beyond the scope of this paper. Whatever the cause, the results can impact morale. Officers who doubt the validity of the system may not stay or may find their commitment, job effectiveness, and job satisfaction impacted. The Defense Manpower Data Center administered the Equal Opportunity Survey from September 1996 through February 1997.¹¹³ One of the events measured in the survey was the respondents' "most bothersome situation." Army service members consistently, regardless of racial/ethnic group, indicated that discrimination in career development or promotion was a part of their most bothersome situation. Twenty-one percent of Blacks, 21 percent of Hispanics, 17 percent of Asian/Pacific Islanders, 33 percent of Native American/AK Natives and 16 percent of Whites indicated this.¹¹⁴ Several officers responding to the USAWC Survey noted that they felt the photograph was being used to pick unqualified minorities and females. Females and minorities often feel the opposite. Beliefs may differ, but morale can suffer regardless of how the photograph is being used.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Several possibilities present themselves. Use of the photograph could be discontinued. The photograph could continue to be used but with the photograph not viewed until after all other data is viewed. Or, the Army could continue to use the photograph as they do at present but incorporate better safeguards into the system.

Limited resources constrain the Army as an organization, and manpower is not immune. It is imperative that the best individuals be selected for promotion. As seen in the literature and survey responses, there are concerns about using photographs. There is no scientific evidence to support the value of using photographs, but much evidence that their use may be problematic. The two earlier experiments conducted at the U.S. Military Academy that found no negative consequences of using photographs were limited and no evidence exists of follow-up studies. There are costs involved in taking the photographs, plus manpower involved in maintaining them in personnel records and promotion board files. Use of the photograph should be dropped because it is inconclusive in benefit and there is much to challenge its benefits.¹¹⁵

If photograph use is continued, photographs should not be viewed until after all other data in the file is reviewed and scoring is completed on the other five categories.¹¹⁶ This would decrease officer concerns about the photograph's influence on the scoring and rank ordering of the files. It would also retain the benefit of having the photograph available for determining military bearing and physical fitness with less suspicion of an impact on other ratings.¹¹⁷ After boards view the photographs in this manner, a survey of board members may be appropriate to assess their satisfaction with this method.

If photographs continue to be used in the manner they are at present, a more proactive role needs to be put in place to ensure that inappropriate judgements are not being made. Training could be given board members on impression formation and the possibility of resulting unfair judgements. The current comment in DA Memo 600-2, that photographs are reviewed for military bearing and physical fitness, could be expanded to provide objective criteria for defining "military bearing." Examples might be a well-fitting uniform, a proper military hairstyle, and proper wearing of awards. Included could be criteria not to be considered: height, use of glasses, uniform election for women, and, of course, attractiveness, race, and gender. Board members might also be reminded that while they are reviewing the photograph for physical fitness, someone with a thick neck is not necessarily unfit or overweight and someone who is thin is not necessarily physically fit.

If the photographs are to be used as they are at present, fairness dictates that officers under consideration be better informed of the impact of impression formation. Women could be advised that they might enhance their perceived managerial qualities and reduce their perceived feminine attributes without a loss of their physical attractiveness by altering their clothing, accessories, cosmetics, and hairstyle. Men could be advised it is to their advantage to play up their attractiveness. The data from the U.S. Military Academy experiments could be explained in an attempt to lessen concerns about use of the photograph. Emphasis could be placed on the restriction on altering digital photographs. All of these topics would be appropriate for Equal Opportunity Training¹¹⁸ or Officer Professional Development courses.

If photographs continue to be used, a study of the cost of digital photographs weighed against the perceived value of the photograph by board members may also be appropriate. Air Force promotion results since 1995 could be studied to determine if board members are satisfied with the change to no

photograph. Air Force statistics on race, gender and ethnicity could also be examined to determine if there is a change in comparison to pre-1995 results.¹¹⁹

CONCLUSION

Promotion is one of the most important personnel actions in terms of money, morale, and career motivation. In an ideal world, important personnel actions would be based solely on relevant factors. That physical characteristics might inappropriately affect promotion decisions is clearly contrary to Army values. It is contrary to a rational model of decision making, and it might be placing those with certain characteristics at an unfair disadvantage. Official photographs have been provided in promotion files for almost the entire career of most officers now on active duty. Change is not easy. However, as noted by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences:

The Army has already set about, as part of the Affirmative Action component of the EO program, to identify and eliminate any policies or procedures found to produce discrimination. This is a continuing effort; every existing policy or procedure, as well as every new one being considered, must be carefully and periodically scrutinized for possible unintended discriminatory effects. Those Army members responsible for creating policy and for overseeing procedures must be fully aware of their responsibilities in this regard.¹²⁰

Facial features, gender, or race need not affect every rating for a change to be warranted. High performers are generally preferred over low performers regardless of level of physical characteristics. But it is the comparisons of equally qualified officers that should be of concern. Once an individual has been categorized, subsequent judgements about that individual may be based on initial categorization rather than on any unbiased review of available information. When the selection-to-applicant ratio is low, as it is in senior officer promotions, extra caution should be taken to continually review procedures to determine if changes need to be made.

WORD COUNT = 9881

ENDNOTES

¹ It wasn't always this way. The first War Department regulation for the promotion of officers was an order of the Secretary of War, dated 26 May 1801. This initial rule simply established promotion by seniority and that basis for promotion remained in effect in the Army through World War II. The Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong., Ch 512, 1st Session, published in Bulletin No. 18, 1947) abolished it. This Act provided for centralized selection boards and was the statutory framework until the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1981 (U.S. Code, vol. 10 secs. 557-563 and 601-640) (DOPMA) replaced it. The Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act of 1996 (U.S. Code, vol. 10, Chapter 1223) provides a similar system for Reserve officers on the reserve active status list. Many of the references in this paper to laws, directives, and regulations cited hereafter apply only to officers on the active duty list. However, unless noted otherwise, corresponding provisions exist which apply to officers on the reserve active status list. The recommendations and conclusions in this paper can be generalized and applied to these promotions, as well.

² DOPMA, secs. 612, 613, 614, and 619.

³ DOPMA, sec. 615. This statute provides that the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations governing information furnished to selection boards, which regulations shall apply uniformly among the military departments. The regulation promulgated under this authority is Department of Defense Instruction No. 1320.14, September 24, 1996, Commissioned Officer Promotion Program Procedures. The statute also provides for regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned to supplement those Defense Department regulations with approval of the Secretary of Defense. Department of the Army, Officer Promotions, Army Regulation 600-8-29 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 30 November 1994) is the Army's implementing regulation.

⁴ DoD regulations do not mandate the use of photographs in the selection process by all military departments. The Secretary of the Army supplemented the DoD regulation and added an official photograph for Army selection boards. AR 600-8-29, 1-33.

⁵ AR 600-8-29, 1.

⁶ Department of the Army, Policies and Procedures for Active-Duty List Officer Selection Boards, Army Memorandum 600-2 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 24 September 1999).

⁷ Ibid., 11.

⁸ U.S. Army PERSCOM, Centralized Army Officer Promotion System, undated, available from <<http://www-perscom.army.mil/select/centpro.htm>>; Internet; accessed 23 November 1999.

⁹ Years of service remained an element for promotion, with promotion to each rank having a corresponding requirement for a certain number of years of service.

¹⁰ The Officer's Guide (Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 1959).

¹¹ Department of the Army, Promotion of Commissioned Officers on Active Duty, Army Regulation 624-115 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 20 October 1960). This promotion regulation is the earliest one available in the historic document section of the Pentagon Library. It also provides that temporary promotion below general officer could be delegated to specific major commanders and commanders of combat theatres of operations to fill local grade vacancies. The battlefield promotion provision remained in the promotion regulations through 15 September 1980.

¹² Department of the Army, Promotion of Officers on Active Duty, Army Regulation 624-100 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 20 October 1975).

¹³ The author was unable to locate a copy of the LOI used during these years, but it is likely that board members began seeing the photograph this early. While this regulation mentions only letters to the board and efficiency reports, the Appendix, Guidance for Promotion Selection Boards, provided for board member review of "the entire record." It also, for the first time, mentioned consideration of general physical condition of a soldier, noting that "disability is not always disqualifying." In 1974, the photograph regulation, for the first time, specifically mentioned the use of the photograph by boards, providing, "photos are a significant element of military personnel files and are of particular interest to DA Selection Boards and career management activities." Department of the Army, Photographs for Military Personnel Files, Army Regulation 640-30 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of the Army, 11 July 1974). This wording in the photograph regulation has been carried forward through the current version of the regulation. Department of the Army, Photographs for Military Personnel Files, Army Regulation 640-30 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of the Army, 1 October 1991).

¹⁴ Department of the Army, Promotion of Officers on Active Duty, Army Regulation 624-100 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of the Army, 1 May 1979).

¹⁵ Department of the Army, Individual Military Personnel Records, Army Regulation 640-10 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of the Army, 15 June 1970).

¹⁶ During the 1950s, the earliest located Army regulation on personnel records was issued. Department of the Army, Personal Records Jacket, U.S. Army, Army Regulation 640-10 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 9 December 1954), superseding SR 345-15-1, 27 April 1951, and SR 345-250-40, 21 January 1952. Revisions of the regulation followed in 1959, 1962, and 1965. The 1965 version of the regulation first mentioned a section of permanent documents. Department of the Army, Military Personnel Records Jacket, U.S. Army, Army Regulation 640-10 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 27 July 1965). That same year, the photograph regulation first mentioned filing of the photograph on the Official Military Personnel File (OMPF). Department of the Army, Personal Records - Photographs, Army Regulation 640-140 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 26 February 1965). The permanent section of records mentioned in AR 640-10 is the OMPF mentioned in the photograph regulation. Photographs were, however, in personnel records during the early years of personnel management under the 1947 Act. The earliest located regulation on photographs required officers in the grade of O6 and above to maintain a "current formal portrait" in their official TAG 201 file and the official DA photographic files. Department of the Army, Photographs, Army Regulation 640-140 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 8 December 1955), superseding Department of the Army message, 2 November 1955. In 1960, the regulation changed the photograph requirement to officers in the grade of O3 and above. Department of the Army, Personal Records - Photographs, Army Regulation 640-140 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 18 February 1963). Mention was made of maintaining photographs in official TAG files and official DA photographic files until 1965, when OMPF filing is mentioned.

¹⁷ AR 640-30, 1 October 1991.

¹⁸ A few years earlier, with the passage of DOPMA, AR 624-100 had been amended to provide that the LOI issued by the Secretary of the Army or on the Secretary's order could modify the terms of the promotion regulation for a particular board without changing the regulation unless contrary to statute.

¹⁹ Department of the Army, Promotion of Officers on Active Duty, Army Regulation 624-100 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1989 All Ranks Update), 2-6.

²⁰ Department of the Army, Officer Promotions, Army Regulation 600-8-29 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 30 November 1994).

²¹ LTC Terry Elling, U.S. Army, JAGC, Chief, Military Personnel Litigation, Department of the Army, Army Legal Services Agency, interview by author, 7 January 2000, Arlington, VA.

²² Department of the Army, Policies and Procedures for Active Component Officer Selection Boards, Department of the Army Memorandum 600-2 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 26 November 1993), 8.c.(1).

²³ The acronym LOI was changed to Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) following a change to the Army correspondence regulation.

²⁴ DA Memo 600-2, 26 November 1993. Paragraph 10 provided as follows: "In evaluating the files of the officers you are about to consider, be alert to the possibility of past personal or institutional discrimination--either intentional or inadvertent--in the assignment patterns, evaluations, or professional development of officers in those groups for which you have an equal opportunity selection goal. Such indicators may include disproportionately lower evaluation reports, assignments of lesser importance or responsibility, or lack of opportunity to attend career-building military school. Taking these factors into consideration, assess the degree to which an officer's record as a whole is an accurate reflection, free from bias, of that officer's performance and potential." Board members were provided equal opportunity selection goals. If a minority or gender group selection rate fell below that goal, boards were required to review the records of those groups and look again for evidence of possible past discrimination that may have disadvantaged these officers. Where an indication of discrimination was found, boards re-voted the record of that officer, taking into consideration the apparent disadvantage, and adjusting the officer's relative standing, if required, accordingly.

²⁵ DA Memo 600-2 was revised effective 24 September 1999. Paragraph 10, Equal Opportunity, was removed. This followed litigation against the Army on its use of EO review and re-vote procedures in promotion boards and selective early retirement boards (SERBs). Sirmans et al. v. Caldera was the earliest challenge to use of review and re-vote procedures in the promotion boards. 27 F. Supp. 2d 248 (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, 1998); final judgement not reported; see Case No. 1:98CV00278, settled in 1999. Christian, v. United States, No. 97-165C, U.S. Court of Federal Claims, case pending, was the first challenge to use of review and re-vote procedures in a SERB. Other challenges have followed.

²⁶ Declaration of Lieutenant General Frederick E. Vollrath, USA, 11 September 1998, filed in court records in Christian v. United States, U.S. Court of Claims, No. 97-165C, p. 19-21.

²⁷ AR 640-30, 1 October 1991, 5a.

²⁸ Memorandum for Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, ODCS PER Form 295-E, 1 May 1995, Digital Imagery for Official DA Photos.

²⁹ Army Visual Information Manager Ronnie I. Gestein, Office of the Secretary of the Army Memorandum, Subject: Procedures for Digital Photography for Official DA Photographs, 18 September 1995.

³⁰ Gestein Memorandum, attaching minutes of Army Visual Information Steering Committee meeting from 29-31 August 1995.

³¹ A review of board MOI from previous years evidences that during transition periods, board MOI explained that several formats were authorized for the photograph and stressed that no adverse inference should be drawn from use of an earlier format.

³² Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch, "Alteration of Official Photographic and Video Imagery," Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments and Others, Washington, D.C., 9 December 1994.

³³ Department of Defense, Alteration of Official DoD Imagery, Department of Defense Directive 5040.5 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, 29 August 1995).

³⁴ Gestein, Memorandum.

³⁵ Steve Bymes, GS8, Photographer, U.S. Army War College, interview by author, 14 January 2000, Carlisle, PA.

³⁶ After-action reports to the Secretary of the Army are required by DA Memo 600-2. In them, the board president highlights collective observations, concerns, and recommendations of the board with regard to the selection process and officer personnel management. Appendix I to DA Memo 600-2, Section I. Reports are marked "close hold" until results are approved, after which time certain paragraphs can be released pursuant to a Freedom of Information Act request. Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552 (1976). The Secretary of the Army also personally interviews, once a year and on a random basis, board presidents, members, recorders, or administrative staff, to ensure that boards are being conducted in accordance with applicable law, regulations, instructions and administrative issuances. This is required by DoD Instruction 1320.14. Department of Defense, Commissioned Officer Promotion Program Procedures, Department of Defense Instruction 1320.14 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, 24 September 1996), 3g. There is no formal record of these conversations; they are neither releasable nor recorded. Interview by author, LTC Joan Sangl, Military Assistant, Personnel Management Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, 30 March 2000, Washington, D.C.

³⁷ Memorandum, TAPC-MSG, Subject: After-Action Report, Fiscal Year 98 Major, Army Competitive Category, Promotion Selection Board -- INFORMATION MEMORANDUM, undated excerpt.

³⁸ Memorandum, TAPC-MSG, Subject: After-Action Report, FY97 Colonel Selection Board -- INFORMATION MEMORANDUM, undated excerpt.

³⁹ Memorandum, TAPC-MSG, Subject: After-Action Report, FY99 Lieutenant Colonel, Army Competitive Category, Promotion Selection Board -- INFORMATION MEMORANDUM, undated excerpt.

⁴⁰ U.S. Army PERSCOM Internet.

⁴¹ See, for example, "Reservists Chided for Poor Photos," Army Reserve Magazine 40, (Fall/Winter 1994), 6.

⁴² The Air Force has chosen to eliminate use of photographs. It will be relevant to examine why later in the discussion section.

⁴³ The list of characteristics that can be influenced by stereotypes is long, including but certainly not limited to gender, race, sexual orientation, marital status, age, social class, facial features, and attractiveness.

⁴⁴ David L. Hamilton, "Stereotypes and Stereotyping: An Overview of the Cognitive Approach," in Prejudice, Discrimination and Racism, ed. John F. Dovidio, (Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, 1986), 127.

⁴⁵ Edward E. Jones, Interpersonal Perception (New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1990), 89.

⁴⁶ Donald B. Calne, Within Reason: Rationality and Human Behavior (New York: Pantheon Books, 1999), 22.

⁴⁷ C. Hull, Aptitude Testing, (New York: Harrap, 1928), quoted in Perry R. Hinton, The Psychology of Interpersonal Perception (New York: Routledge, 1993), 8.

⁴⁸ Egon Brunswik, Perception and the Representative Design of Psychological Experiments (Stanford, California: University of California Press, 1956), quoted in Hinton, 9.

⁴⁹ David Gilmore, Terry A. Beehr, and Kevin G. Love, "Effects of Applicant Sex, Applicant Physical Attractiveness, Type of Rater and Type of Job on Interview Decisions," Journal of Occupational Psychology 59 (1986): 103.

⁵⁰ Nadia Bugg and Diana G. Pounder, "Student Admission Decision-Making: Good Looks, Better Success," undated, available from <<http://www.gse.utah.edu/edadm/appatr93.htm>>; Internet; accessed 11 February 2000.

⁵¹ M. Clifford and Elaine Walster, "The Effect of Physical Attractiveness on Teacher Evaluation," Sociology of Education 46 (1973): 248.

⁵² M. G. Efran and E. Patterson, "Voters Vote Beautiful: The Effect of Physical Appearance on a National Debate," Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science 6 (1974): 354.

⁵³ M. G. Efran, "The Effect of Physical Appearance on the Judgement of Guilt, Interpersonal Attraction, and Severity of Recommended Punishment in a Simulated Jury Task," Journal of Experimental Research in Personality 8 (1974): 51.

⁵⁴ This inference may not necessarily carry over to official photographs. In an undated excerpt from After-Action Report, Fiscal Year 1996 Captain, Army Competitive Category, Promotion Selection Board -- INFORMATION MEMORANDUM, it was noted that, "(O)fficers who normally wear glasses may want to have their photo taken without them to avoid a glare which often appears from the flash and detracts from an otherwise good photo."

⁵⁵ Diana J. Kyle and Heike I. M. Mahler, "The Effects of hair Color and Cosmetic Use on Perceptions of a Female's Ability," Psychology of Women Quarterly 20 (1996): 447.

⁵⁶ Cathryn L. Cox and William H. Glick, "Resume Evaluation and Cosmetic Use: When More is Not Better," Sex Roles 14, v 1/2 (1986): 58

⁵⁷ Allan Mazur, Julie Mazur, and Caroline Keating, "Military Rank Attainment of a West Point Class: Effects of a Cadets' Physical Features," American Journal of Sociology 90, no. 1 (1984): 125.

⁵⁸ Allan Mazur and Ulrich Mueller, "Channel Modeling: From West Point Cadet to General," Public Administration Review 56 (March/April 1996): 191.

⁵⁹ At the time of the first study, the members of the Class had not obtained general officer rank in sufficient quantity. At that time, the study suggested a link between facial features and order of merit list while at the Academy. The researchers did not, however, see that link in promotions to field grade rank. At the time of the first study, the authors hypothesized that perhaps faces lost their dominance as the subjects aged. For the second look at the Class, the authors obtained recent photographs of the cadets and determined that a dominant face in youth remained dominant looking in middle age.

⁶⁰ The first study considered briefly whether it is possible that those with dominant features were expected to be leaders, and that they therefore acted that way. This aspect of appearance is beyond the scope of this paper.

⁶¹ Laura A. Mast, "Impression Formation: Do Facial Features or Body Types have a Greater Influence on First Impressions?", 5 December 1996, available from MWSC Psychology research page <<http://www.psych.mwsc.edu/research/>>; Internet; accessed 11 February 2000.

⁶² *Russell v. Salve Regina College* (890 F.2d 484, 1989).

⁶³ *Craft v. Metromedia, Inc., d/b/a KMBC-TV 9* (776 F.2d 1205, 1985).

⁶⁴ Jonathan Marshall, "Attractive People Often Higher Paid," *Chicago Tribune*, 14 November 1993, p. 11.

⁶⁵ Gary Robertson, "Legal Looks," *Richmond Times Dispatch*, 15 January 1996, p. D-23.

⁶⁶ This may be explained in terms of stereotypical expectations: if attractive men are seen as more masculine than unattractive ones, and attractive women are seen as more feminine than less attractive ones, the attractive man will be seen as more suitable for a post requiring stereotypically male characteristics, such as leadership and decisiveness. An attractive woman might be seen as "too feminine" for that same position and hence judged less suitable. Perhaps less attractive women have a significant edge landing traditionally male positions because they are more able to step out of sex roles. It may not be attractiveness per se but rather femininity that leads to attractive women being at a disadvantage in masculine gender-typed jobs. Whatever the reasons, the implication is that it pays to appear as unattractive and masculine as possible to succeed in some organizations.

⁶⁷ Department of the Army, Photographs for Military Personnel Files, Army Regulation 640-30 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 6 April 1976) with Interim Change 1, 1 February 1982

⁶⁸ Department of the Army, Photographs for Military Personnel Files, Army Regulation 640-30 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 16 October 1985).

⁶⁹ Ibid., reprint with change, 19 March 1986, 7a(2).

⁷⁰ Department of the Army, Wear and Appearance of Army Uniforms and Insignia, Army Regulation 670-1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 September 1992), 36, 83-84.

⁷¹ Department of the Army, Photographs for Military Personnel Files, Army Regulation 640-30 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 October 1991), 7.

⁷² Byrne, interview.

⁷³ Barry Glassner, "The Winning Politico is Usually Head and Shoulders Above the Rest," Los Angeles Times, 9 March 1988, Metro Sec., p. 7.

⁷⁴ Farai Chideya, Don't Believe the Hype: Fighting Cultural Misinformation About African-Americans, (New York: Plume Press, 1995), 21.

⁷⁵ J. Norman Baldwin, "The Promotion Record of the United States Army: Glass Ceilings in the Officer Corps," Public Administration Review 56 (March/April 1996): 202-203.

⁷⁶ James A. Thomas, "Institutional Discrimination in the U.S. Army: Black Personnel (1962-1982)" in U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences Race Relations Research in the U.S. Army in the 1970's: A Collection of Selected Reading, ed. James A. Thomas (Alexandria, VA: Government Printing Office 1988), 471.

⁷⁷ Bernd Wittenbrink, Charles M. Judd, and Bernadette Park, "Evidence for Racial Prejudice at the Implicit Level and its Relationship with Questionnaire Measures," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 72, No. 2 (1997): 262.

⁷⁸ Byrne, interview.

⁷⁹ Major Bruce Held, Letter to Editor, "Promotion Photos Can Lie," Army Times, 14 August 1995, p. 28.

⁸⁰ AR 600-8-29, 9.

⁸¹ Byrne, interview.

⁸² Memorandum, TAPC-MSG, Subject: After-Action Report, Fiscal Year 1996 Captain, Army Competitive Category, Promotion Selection Board -- INFORMAL MEMORANDUM, undated excerpt.

⁸³ Memorandum, Calendar Year 1998 Reserve Components Major, Army Promotion List Selection Board - After Action Report, 27 April 1998.

⁸⁴ The author had hoped to analyze responses based on gender to see if they varied significantly. However, because of the low number of female respondents, such an analysis would not be meaningful.

⁸⁵ Three placed themselves in the category "Black"; two placed themselves in the category "Hispanic"; two placed themselves in the category "Asian/Pacific Islander"; three indicated "Other." There was no significant difference in their responses to survey questions.

⁸⁶ One respondent did not answer any of the introductory questions on status, rank, race, and sex.

⁸⁷ Each year, the U.S. Army War College class consists of approximately 325 Army officer students in the ranks of O5 and O6. On 31 January 2000, there were 9,892 O5s and 3,496 O6s on active duty in the Army.

⁸⁸ Due to rounding, responses will not always total 100%.

⁸⁹ USAWC students and faculty/staff may be above the norm in appreciating the importance of the photograph. The 1996 captain board noted that approximately 150 files were missing photographs (out of roughly 4000) but that fewer than five documented explanations were offered in the letters to the board.

After-Action Report, Fiscal Year 1996 Captain. The logistical difficulty with obtaining a photograph as a member of the Reserves is highlighted by a recent note that nearly 40% of the files did not have a photograph. Memorandum, Calendar Year 1998 Reserve Components Colonel, Army Promotion List (APL) Selection Board - After Action Report, 14 August 1998.

⁹⁰ One respondent noted he gave equal weight to all six items; one did not remember; two did not respond.

⁹¹ R. A. Stewart, G. E. Power, and S. J. Chetwynd, Person Perception and Stereotyping (London: Saxon House, 1979), 20.

⁹² Jones, 84.

⁹³ Taylor, interview. That notwithstanding, a general officer who has sat on numerous boards indicated to the author, with a pledge of confidence, that board members do in fact make verbal comments such as "take a look at this guy's mustache."

⁹⁴ Perry R. Hinton, The Psychology of Interpersonal Perception (New York: Routledge, 1993), 98.

⁹⁵ Jones, 84.

⁹⁶ There are more than six scores possible; each number can be plus or minus, as well.

⁹⁷ Taylor, interview.

⁹⁸ Lisa Sinclair and Ziva Kunda, "Reactions to a Black Professional: Motivated Inhibition and Activation of Conflicting Stereotypes," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 77, no. 5 (1999): 885.

⁹⁹ C. Neil Macrae, Galen V. Bodenhausen, and Alan B. Milne, "The Dissection of Selection in Person Perception: Inhibitory Processes in Social Stereotyping," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, No. 3 (1995): 405.

¹⁰⁰ Sinclair, 887.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Irene V. Blair and Mahzarin R. Banaji, "Automatic and Controlled Processes in Stereotyping Priming," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, no. 6 (1996): 1159.

¹⁰³ J. A. Bargh, "The Cognitive Monster: The Case Against the Controllability of Automatic Stereotype Effects," in Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology, ed. S. Chaiken and Y. Trope (New York: Guilford Press, 1999), 361.

¹⁰⁴ Gilmore, 108.

¹⁰⁵ The results of the experiments were not published. The author discovered their existence when interviewing LTC Terry Elling, Office of the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, on 7 January 2000. LTC Elling was the Army attorney on the Sirmans case cited in endnote 25. The author then contacted the U.S. Military Academy and spoke with LTC Jose A. Picart, Academy Professor and Director of Psychology Studies, who was on the research team in 1989. The results of one experiment are recorded in Human Sciences Laboratory Report 89-5, Effect of the DA Photograph on Board Member's

Judgements," dated September 1991. The results of the other experiment were not recorded in a report. However, LTC Picart provided the author with a copy of his briefing slides (used when he briefed the DA Secretariat for Selection Boards in 1989) along with explanatory notes and further information during an telephone interview on 10 February 2000.

¹⁰⁶ DA Memo 600-2, 11.

¹⁰⁷ Report 89-5, 1.

¹⁰⁸ Air Force Regulation 36-93, 28 February 1990, provides that Air Force senior leadership and the Selection Board Secretariat place considerable importance on the photograph, using it to partially bridge the gap between a personal interview and a record at promotion boards. Nevertheless, effective 1 January 1995, the Air Force stopped using official photographs on selection boards for colonels and below. They are still used for general officers.

¹⁰⁹ Major Susan Hogg, U.S. Air Force Office of Promotion and Evaluation Policy, telephone interview with author on 15 February 2000. Major Hogg summarized the history of the deletion from files in that office, and provided the summary along with the Staff Summary Sheet used to obtain Secretary of the Air Force approval of the change, dated 7 November 1994; a 21 October 1994 Talking Paper on Post-Board Survey Results; a 30 November 1994 Issue Paper on Officer Promotion Selection Brief Modification; and a copy of an document prepared by her office to response to Air Force Times' questions regarding deletion of the official photograph.

¹¹⁰ LTC Samuel Nichols, AR-PERSCOM, telephone interview with author, 18 January 2000. These cost figures were provided before the use of digital photographs, which eliminated wet-processing costs and manpower returning to the photograph lab. LTC Nichols indicated that he never heard back from Army on his proposal and, to the best of his knowledge, it was not processed beyond the command where he submitted it.

¹¹¹ See, for example, Charles Moskos, "Affirmative Action in the Army: Why It Works," in The Affirmative Action Debate, ed. George E. Curry (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1996), 229.

¹¹² Office of the Under Secretary of Defense Personnel and Readiness, Career Progression of Minority and Women Officers, Washington, D.C.: 1999, available from <<http://dticam.dtic.mil/prhome>>; Internet, accessed 1 December 1999.

¹¹³ Defense Manpower Data Center, Equal Opportunity Survey, Washington, D.C.: 1999, available from <<http://dticam.dtic.mil/prhome>>; Internet, accessed 1 December 1999.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 79. There were fewer differences by race/ethnic group in response to another question. Overall, 40 percent of the Army personnel surveyed said that they agree/strongly agree that if they stay in the service, they will be promoted as high as their ability and effort warrant. Thirty-eight percent of the Whites responded this way, 41 percent of the Blacks, 46 percent of Hispanics, 48 percent of Asian/Pacific Islanders, and 44 percent of Native American/Alaskan Natives. 156.

¹¹⁵ This, too, was the recommendation of Baldwin at 205, following an analysis of promotion results and a determination that those promoted and considered for promotion in the Army are disproportionately male and Caucasian. As indicated earlier, the recommendations in this paper do not rely on a determination of whether or not promotion results disproportionately favor Caucasian males.

¹¹⁶ This was a recommendation from the U.S. Military Academy experiment. In the experiment, the photograph was placed face down in a short envelope taped to the inside back cover of the file folder. Participants were instructed to view the photograph and score the military bearing/physical fitness criterion only after the scores for all other criteria had been entered into the computer. Report 89-5, 10.

¹¹⁷ Viewing the photograph after considering other data may be quite easily done. One of the articulated reasons for change to a digital imaging system in 1995 was to provide for PERMS integration. The DA Photo Management Information System (DAPMIS), jointly administered by Information Management offices and PERSCOM, puts that technology to use. Phase I of DAPMIS, designed to enhance accountability for photos in PERSCOM, has already begun. Hard copy photos are recorded and tagged as they arrive at PERSCOM, providing an audit trail for their location within PERSCOM and a receipt to the field. Work has begun on Phase 2 of DAPMIS, a requirement analysis for a digital system which would eventually have field photograph labs sending digital photographs over secure Web applications directly to a digital repository in PERSCOM. Soldiers could review their photographs online if desired before they are submitted for use by digital selection boards who are viewing the entire promotion file on a computer screen. Major Robert Campbell, Personnel Policy Integrator, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, interview with author, 30 March 2000, Washington, D.C.

¹¹⁸ Equal Opportunity training has been a part of the Army since the early 1970s. The Army's program of race-relations education was established following racial violence on both stateside and overseas bases in 1969 and 1970. In late 1971, the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs was established as a part of the staff of the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel.

¹¹⁹ Caution should be used, however, in such a comparison. Papers provided by Major Susan Hogg indicate that until 1995, the photograph was the only thing available for use in reporting race/ethnic statistics required by Department of Defense. The fact that someone appears to be of a certain race or ethnic group does not necessarily mean that they are. The Army is not immune from questions on the accuracy of their statistics. In 1976 the method of identifying Hispanics changed to self-designation. Previously, as in some other institutions, statistics were based on counts of individuals with Hispanic surnames. Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Statistical Series Pamphlet 96-1, Representation of Minorities and Women in the Armed Forces 1976-1995, Patrick AFB, Florida: 1996, 1. In addition, such a review of Air Force promotions should take into account the possible change from fully qualified to best qualified as the promotion standard following the passage of ROPMA.

¹²⁰ Race Relations in the U.S. Army, 471.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"After-Action Report, Fiscal Year 1996 Captain, Army Competitive Category, Promotion Selection Board - INFORMATION MEMORANDUM." TAPC-MSG memorandum for Secretary of the Army. Washington, D.C., undated

"After-Action Report, Fiscal Year 98 Major, Army Competitive Category, Promotion Selection Board -- INFORMATION MEMORANDUM." TAPC-MSG memorandum for Secretary of the Army. Washington, D.C. Undated.

"After-Action Report, FY97 Colonel Selection Board -- INFORMATION MEMORANDUM." TAPC-MSG memorandum for Secretary of the Army. Washington, D.C. Undated.

"After-Action Report, FY99 Lieutenant Colonel, Army Competitive Category, Promotion Selection Board -- INFORMATION MEMORANDUM." TAPC-MSG memorandum for Secretary of the Army. Washington, D.C. Undated.

"Calendar Year 1998 Reserve Components Colonel, Army Promotion List (APL) Selection Board - After Action Report." Memorandum for Secretary of the Army. St Louis, MO, 14 August 1998.

"Calendar Year 1998 Reserve Components Major, Army Promotion List Selection Board - After Action Report." Memorandum for Secretary of the Army. St Louis, MO, 27 April 1998.

"Effect of the DA Photograph on Board Member's Judgements." U.S. Military Academy Human Sciences Laboratory Report 89-5. September 1991.

"Reservists Chided for Poor Photos." Army Reserve Magazine, Fall/Winter 1994: 6-7.

Baldwin, J. Norman. "The Promotion Record of the United States Army: Glass Ceilings in the Officer Corps." Public Administration Review 56 (March/April 1996): 199-206.

Bargh, J. A. "The Cognitive Monster: The Case Against the Controllability of Automatic Stereotype Effects." In Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology, ed. S. Chaiken and Y. Trope, 360-379. New York: Guilford Press, 1999.

Blair, Irene V. and Banaji, Mahzarin R. "Automatic and Controlled Processes in Stereotyping Priming" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 70, no. 6 (1996): 1142-1163.

Blanck, Peter David, ed. Interpersonal Expectations: Theory, Research, and Applications. New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1993.

Bromley, D.B. Reputation, Image and Impression Management. S. Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons, 1993.

Brunswik, Egon. Perception and the Representative Design of Psychological Experiments. Stanford, California: University of California Press, 1956. Quoted in Perry R. Hinton, The Psychology of Interpersonal Perception, New York: Routledge, 1993.

Bugg, Nadia Pounder, Diana G. "Student Admission Decision-Making: Good Looks, Better Success." Undated. Available from <<http://www.gse.utah.edu/edadm/appatr93.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 11 February 2000.

Butler, Remo. "Why Black Officers Fail." Parameters 29 (Autumn 1999): 54-69.

Byrnes, Steve, Photographer. Interview by author, 14 January 2000, Carlisle, PA.

Calne, Donald B. Within Reason: Rationality and Human Behavior. New York: Pantheon Books, 1999.

Campbell, Major Robert, Personnel Policy Integrator, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel. Interview by author, 30 March 2000, Washington, D.C.

Chideya, Farai. Don't Believe the Hype: Fighting Cultural Misinformation About African-Americans. New York: Plume Press, 1995.

Christian, v. United States, No. 97-165C, U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

Clifford, M. and Walster, Elaine. "The Effect of Physical Attractiveness on Teacher Evaluation." Sociology of Education 46 (1973): 248-261.

Cox, Cathryn L. and Glick, William H. "Resume Evaluation and Cosmetic Use: When More is Not Better." Sex Roles 14, no 1/2 (1986): 51-59.

Craft v. Metromedia, Inc., d/b/a KMBC-TV 9 (776 F.2d 1205, 1985).

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Statistical Series Pamphlet 96-1. Representation of Minorities and Women in the Armed Forces 1976-1995. Patrick AFB, Florida: 1996.

Defense Manpower Data Center. "Equal Opportunity Survey." 1999. Available from <<http://dticam.dtic.mil/prhome>>. Internet. Accessed 1 December 1999.

Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1981, U.S. Code, Vol. 10, secs. 557-563 and 601-640.

Department of the Army. Policies and Procedures for Active-Duty List Officer Selection Boards. Department of the Army Memorandum 600-2. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 24 September 1999.

Deutch, John, Deputy Secretary of Defense. "Alteration of Official Photographic and Video Imagery." Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments and Others. Washington, D.C., 9 December 1994.

Efran, M. G. "The Effect of Physical Appearance on the Judgement of Guilt, Interpersonal Attraction, and Severity of Recommended Punishment in a Simulated Jury Task." Journal of Experimental Research in Personality 8 (1974): 51-59.

Efran, M. G. and Patterson, E. "Voters Vote Beautiful: The Effect of Physical Appearance on a National Debate." Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science 6 (1974): 352-356.

Elling, Lieutenant Colonel Terry, U.S. Army, JAGC, Chief, Military Personnel Litigation, Department of the Army, Army Legal Services Agency, interview by author, 7 January 2000, Arlington, VA.

Freedom of Information Act, U.S. Code. Vol. 5, sec. 552 (1976).

Gerstein, Ronnie I., Army Visual Information Manager. "Procedures for Digital Photography for Official DA Photographs." Washington, D.C., 18 September 1995.

Gilmore, David, Beehr, Terry A., and Love, Kevin G. "Effects of Applicant Sex, Applicant Physical Attractiveness, Type of Rater and Type of Job on Interview Decisions." Journal of Occupational Psychology 59 (1986): 103-109.

Glassner, Barry. "The Winning Politico is Usually Head and Shoulders Above the Rest." Los Angeles Times, 9 March 1988, p. 7.

Hamilton, David L. "Stereotypes and Stereotyping: An Overview of the Cognitive Approach," in Prejudice, Discrimination and Racism, ed. John F. Dovidio, 127-163. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, 1986.

Held, Major Bruce. Letter to Editor. "Promotion Photos Can Lie." Army Times, 14 August 1995, p. 28.

Hinton, Perry R. The Psychology of Interpersonal Perception. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Hogg, Major Susan, U.S. Air Force Office of Promotion and Evaluation Policy. Telephone interview with author, 15 February 2000.

Hull, C. Aptitude Testing. New York: Harrap, 1928. Quoted in Perry R. Hinton, The Psychology of Interpersonal Perception, New York: Routledge, 1993.

Jones, Edward E. Interpersonal Perception. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1990.

Kyle, Diana J. and Mahler, Heike I. M. "The Effects of hair Color and Cosmetic Use on Perceptions of a Female's Ability." Psychology of Women Quarterly 20 (1996): 447-455.

Macrae, C. Neil, Bodenhausen, Galen V. and Milne, Alan B. "The Dissection of Selection in Person Perception: Inhibitory Processes in Social Stereotyping." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 69, No. 3 (1995): 397-407.

Marshall, Jonathan. "Attractive People Often Higher Paid." Chicago Tribune, 14 November 1993, p. 11.

Mast, Laura A. "Impression Formation: Do Facial Features or Body Types have a Greater Influence on First Impressions?". 5 December 1996. Available from MWSC Psychology research page <<http://www.psych.mwsc.edu/research/>>. Internet. Accessed 11 February 2000.

Mazur, Allan and Mueller, Ulrich. "Channel Modeling: From West Point Cadet to General." Public Administration Review 56 (March/April 1996): 191-198.

Mazur, Allan, Mazur, Julie, and Keating, Caroline. "Military Rank Attainment of a West Point Class: Effects of a Cadets' Physical Features." American Journal of Sociology 90, no. 1 (1984): 125-150.

Moskos, Charles. "Affirmative Action in the Army: Why It Works." In The Affirmative Action Debate, ed. George E. Curry, 227-238. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1996.

Nichols, Lieutenant Colonel Samuel, Army Reserve-PERSCOM. Telephone interview by author, 18 January 2000.

Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. "Digital Imagery for Official DA Photos." Memorandum for Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel. Washington, D.C., 1 May 1995.

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense Personnel and Readiness. "Career Progression of Minority and Women Officers." 1999. Available from <<http://dticam.dtic.mil/prhome>>. Internet, Accessed 1 December 1999.

Officer Personnel Act of 1947, Public Law 381, Bulletin No. 18, 1947.

Picart, Lieutenant Colonel Jose A., Academy Professor and Director of Psychology Studies, U.S. Military Academy. Interview by author, 10 February 2000.

Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act, U.S. Code, Vol 10, chapter 1223.

Robertson, Gary. "Legal Looks." Richmond Times Dispatch, 15 January 1996, p. D-23.

Russell v. Salve Regina College (890 F.2d 484, 1989).

Sangl, Lieutenant Colonel Joan, Military Assistant, Personnel Management Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. Interview by author, 30 March 2000, Washington, D.C.

Sinclair, Lisa and Kunda, Ziva. "Reactions to a Black Professional: Motivated Inhibition and Activation of Conflicting Stereotypes" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 77, no. 5 (1999): 885-904.

Sirmans et al. v. Caldera, 27 F. Supp. 248 (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, 1998), Case No. 1:98CV00278.

Stewart, R. A., Power, G. E., and Chetwynd, S. J. Person Perception and Stereotyping. London: Saxon House, 1979.

The Officer's Guide. Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 1959.

Thomas, James A. "Institutional Discrimination in the U.S. Army: Black Personnel (1962-1982)." In U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences Race Relations Research in the U.S. Army in the 1970's: A Collection of Selected Reading, ed. James A. Thomas, 413-579. Alexandria, VA: Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Air Force. Air Force Regulation 36-93. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Air Force, 28 February 1990.

_____. Issue Paper. "Officer Promotion Selection Brief Modification." 30 November 1994.

_____. Summary Sheet for Secretary of the Air Force. 7 November 1994.

_____. Talking Paper. "Post-Board Survey Results." 21 October 1994.

U.S. Army PERSCOM. "Centralized Army Officer Promotion System." Undated. Available from <<http://www-perscom.army.mil/select/centpro.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 23 November 1999.

U.S. Department of Defense, Commissioned Officer Promotion Program Procedures, Department of Defense Instruction 1320.14. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, 24 September 1996.

_____. Alteration of Official DoD Imagery. Department of Defense Directive 5040.5. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, 29 August 1995.

_____. Commissioned Officer Promotion Program Procedures. Department of Defense Instruction No. 1320.14. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Defense, 14 September 1996.

U.S. Department of the Army. Individual Military Personnel Records. Army Regulation 640-10. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of the Army, 15 June 1970.

_____. Military Personnel Records Jacket, U.S. Army. Army Regulation 640-10. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 27 July 1965.

_____. Officer Promotions. Army Regulation 600-8-29. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 30 November 1994.

- _____. Personal Records - Photographs. Army Regulation 640-140. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 26 February 1965.
- _____. Personal Records - Photographs. Army Regulation 640-140. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 18 February 1963.
- _____. Personal Records Jacket, U.S. Army. Army Regulation 640-10. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 9 December 1954.
- _____. Photographs for Military Personnel Files. Army Regulation 640-30. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 11 July 1974.
- _____. Photographs for Military Personnel Files. Army Regulation 640-30. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 6 April 1976 with Interim Change 1, 1 February 1982.
- _____. Photographs for Military Personnel Files. Army Regulation 640-30. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 16 October 1985.
- _____. Photographs for Military Personnel Files. Army Regulation 640-30. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 October 1991.
- _____. Photographs. Army Regulation 640-140. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 8 December 1955.
- _____. Policies and Procedures for Active Component Officer Selection Boards. Department of the Army Memorandum 600-2. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 26 November 1993.
- _____. Promotion of Commissioned Officers on Active Duty. Army Regulation 624-115. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 20 October 1960.
- _____. Promotion of Officers on Active Duty. Army Regulation 624-100. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 20 October 1975.
- _____. Promotion of Officers on Active Duty. Army Regulation 624-100. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 May 1979.
- _____. Promotion of Officers on Active Duty. Army Regulation 624-100. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1989 All Ranks Update.
- _____. Wear and Appearance of Army Uniforms and Insignia. Army Regulation 670-1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 September 1992.

Vollrath, Lieutenant General Frederick E., USA, 11 September 1998, in Christian v. United States, U.S. Court of Claims, No. 97-165C.

Wittenbrick, Bernd, Judd, Charles M., and Park, Bernadette. "Evidence for Racial Prejudice at the Implicit Level and its Relationship with Questionnaire Measures." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 72, No. 2 (1997): 262-274.